2

Urban Utopias: Ebenezer Howard and Le Corbusier

Robert Fishman

Introduction

What is the ideal city for the twentieth century, the city that best expresses the power and beauty of modern technology and the most enlightened ideas of social justice? Between 1890 and 1930 three planners, Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier, tried to answer that question. Each began his work alone, devoting long hours to preparing literally hundreds of models and drawings specifying every aspect of the new city, from its general ground plan to the layout of the typical living room. There were detailed plans for factories, office buildings, schools, parks, transportation systems – all innovative designs in themselves and all integrated into a revolutionary restructuring of urban form. The economic and political organization of the city, which could not be easily shown in drawings, was worked out in the voluminous writings that each planner appended to his designs. Finally, each man devoted himself to passionate and unremitting efforts to make his ideal city a reality.

Many people dream of a better world; Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier each went a step further and planned one. Their social

consciences took this rare and remarkable step because they believed that, more than any other goal, their societies needed new kinds of cities. They were deeply fearful of the consequences for civilization if the old cities, with all the social conflicts and miseries they embodied, were allowed to persist. They were also inspired by the prospect that a radical reconstruction of the cities would solve not only the urban crisis of their time but the social crisis as well. The very completeness of their ideal cities expressed their convictions that the moment had come for comprehensive programs, and for a total rethinking of the principles of urban planning. They rejected the possibility of gradual improvement. They did not seek the amelioration of the old cities, but a wholly transformed urban environment.

This transformation meant the extensive rebuilding and even partial abandonment of the cities of their time. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier did not shrink from this prospect; they welcomed it. As Howard put it, the old cities had "done their work." They were the best that the old economic and social order could have been expected to produce, but they had to be superseded if mankind were to attain a higher level of civilization. The three ideal cities were put forward to establish the basic theoretical framework for this radical reconstruction. They were the manifestoes for an urban revolution.

These ideal cities are perhaps the most ambitious and complex statements of the belief that reforming the physical environment can revolutionize the total life of a society. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier saw design as an active force, distributing the benefits of the Machine Age to all and directing the community onto the paths of social harmony. Yet they never subscribed to the narrow simplicities of the "doctrine of salvation by bricks alone" – the idea that physical facilities could *by themselves* solve social problems. To be sure, they believed – and who can doubt this? – that the values of family life could be better maintained in a house or apartment that gave each member the light and air and room he needed, rather than in the cramped and fetid slums that were still the fate of too many families. They thought that social solidarity would be better promoted in cities that brought people together, rather than in those whose layout segregated the inhabitants by race or class.

At the same time the three planners understood that these and other well-intended designs would be worse than useless if their benevolent humanitarianism merely covered up basic inequalities in the social system. The most magnificent and innovative housing project would fail if its inhabitants were too poor and oppressed to lead decent lives. There was little point in constructing new centers of community life if the economics of exploitation and class conflict kept the citizens as divided as they had been in their old environment. Good planning was indeed efficacious in creating social harmony, but only if it embodied a genuine rationality and justice in the structure of society. It was impossible in a

society still immured in what Le Corbusier called "the Age of Greed." The three planners realized that they had to join their programs of urban reconstruction with programs of political and economic reconstruction. They concluded (to paraphrase one of Marx's famous *Theses on Feuerbach*) that designers had hitherto merely *ornamented* the world in various ways; the point was to *change* it.

The ideal cities were therefore accompanied by detailed programs for radical changes in the distribution of wealth and power, changes that Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier regarded as the necessary complements to their revolutions in design. The planners also played prominent roles in the movements that shared their aims. Howard was an ardent cooperative socialist who utilized planning as part of his search for the cooperative commonwealth; Wright, a Jeffersonian democrat and an admirer of Henry George, was a spokesman for the American decentrist movement; and Le Corbusier had many of his most famous designs published for the first time in the pages of the revolutionary syndicalist journals he edited. All three brought a revolutionary fervor to the practice of urban design.

And, while the old order endured, Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier refused to adapt themselves to what planning commissions, bankers, politicians, and all the other authorities of their time believed to be desirable and attainable. They consistently rejected the idea that a planner's imagination must work within the system. Instead, they regarded the physical structure of the cities in which they lived, and the economic structure of the society in which they worked, as temporary aberrations that mankind would soon overcome. The three planners looked beyond their own troubled time to a new age each believed was imminent, a new age each labored to define and to build.

Their concerns thus ranged widely over architecture, urbanism, economics, and politics, but their thinking found a focus and an adequate means of expression only in their plans for ideal cities. The cities were never conceived of as blueprints for any actual project. They were "ideal types" of cities for the future, elaborate models rigorously designed to illustrate the general principles that each man advocated. They were convenient and attractive intellectual tools that enabled each planner to bring together his many innovations in design, and to show them as part of a coherent whole, a total redefinition of the idea of the city. The setting of these ideal cities was never any actual location, but an empty, abstract plane where no contingencies existed. The time was the present, not any calendar day or year, but that revolutionary "here and now" when the hopes of the present are finally realized.

These hopes, moreover, were both architectural and social. In the three ideal cities, the transformation of the physical environment is the outward sign of an inner transformation in the social structure. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier used their ideal cities to depict a world in which

their political and economic goals had already been achieved. Each planner wanted to show that the urban designs he advocated were not only rational and beautiful in themselves but that they embodied the social goals he believed in. In the context of the ideal city each proposal for new housing, new factories, and other structures could be seen to further the broader aims. And in general, the ideal cities enabled the three planners to show modern design in what they believed was its true context – as an integral part of a culture from which poverty and exploitation had disappeared. These cities, therefore, were complete alternative societies, intended as a revolution in politics and economics as well as in architecture. They were utopian visions of a total environment in which man would live in peace with his fellow man and in harmony with nature. They were social thought in three dimensions.

As theorists of urbanism, Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier attempted to define the ideal form of any industrial society. They shared a common assumption that this form could be both defined and attained, but each viewed the ideal through the perspective of his own social theory, his own national tradition, and his own personality. Their plans, when compared, disagree profoundly, and the divergences are often just as significant as the agreements. They offer us not a single blueprint for the future but three sets of choices – the great metropolis, moderate decentralization, or extreme decentralization – each with its corresponding political and social implications. Like the classical political triad of monarchy – aristocracy – democracy, the three ideal cities represent a vocabulary of basic forms that can be used to define the whole range of choices available to the planner.

Seventeen years older than Wright and thirty-seven years older than Le Corbusier, Ebenezer Howard started first. His life resembles a story by Horatio Alger, except that Alger never conceived a hero at once so ambitious and so self-effacing. He began his career as a stenographer and ended as the elder statesman of a worldwide planning movement, yet he remained throughout his life the embodiment of the "little man." He was wholly without pretension, an earnest man with a round, bald head, spectacles, and a bushy mustache, unselfconscious in his baggy pants and worn jackets, beloved by neighbors and children.

Yet Howard, like the inventors, enlighteners, self-taught theorists, and self-proclaimed prophets of the "age of improvement" in which he lived, was one of those little men with munificent hopes. His contribution was "the Garden City," a plan for moderate decentralization and cooperative socialism. He wanted to build wholly new cities in the midst of unspoiled countryside on land that would remain the property of the community as a whole. Limited in size to 30,000 inhabitants and surrounded by a perpetual "greenbelt," the Garden City would be compact, efficient, healthful, and beautiful. It would lure people away from swollen cities like London and their dangerous concentrations of wealth and power; at

the same time, the countryside would be dotted with hundreds of new communities where small-scale cooperation and direct democracy could flourish.

Howard never met either Frank Lloyd Wright or Le Corbusier. One suspects those two architects of genius and forceful personalities would have considered themselves worlds apart from the modest stenographer. Yet it is notable that Wright and Le Corbusier, like Howard, began their work in urban planning as outsiders, learning their profession not in architectural schools but through apprenticeships with older architects and through their own studies. This self-education was the source of their initiation into both urban design and social theory, and it continued even after Wright and Le Corbusier had become masters of their own profession. Their interests and readings flowed naturally from architecture and design to city planning, economics, politics, and the widest questions of social thought. No one ever told them they could not know everything.

Frank Lloyd Wright stands between Howard and Le Corbusier, at least in age. If Howard's dominant value was cooperation, Wright's was individualism. And no one can deny that he practiced what he preached. With the handsome profile and proud bearing of a frontier patriarch, carefully brushed long hair, well-tailored suits, and flowing cape, Wright was his own special creation. His character was an inextricable mix of arrogance and honesty, vanity and genius. He was autocratic, impolitic, and spendthrift; yet he maintained a magnificent faith in his own ideal of "organic" architecture.

Wright wanted the whole United States to become a nation of individuals. His planned city, which he called "Broadacres," took decentralization beyond the small community (Howard's ideal) to the individual family home. In Broadacres all cities larger than a county seat have disappeared. The center of society has moved to the thousands of homesteads that cover the countryside. Everyone has the right to as much land as he can use, a minimum of an acre per person. Most people work part-time on their farms and part-time in the small factories, offices, or shops that are nestled among the farms. A network of superhighways joins together the scattered elements of society. Wright believed that individuality must be founded on individual ownership. Decentralization would make it possible for everyone to live his chosen lifestyle on his own land.

Le Corbusier, our third planner, could claim with perhaps even more justification than Wright to be his own creation. He was born Charles-Édouard Jeanneret and grew up in the Swiss city of La Chaux-de-Fonds, where he was apprenticed to be a watchcase engraver. He was saved from that dying trade by a sympathetic teacher and by his own determination. Settling in Paris in 1916, he won for himself a place at the head of the avant-garde, first with his painting, then with his brilliant

architectural criticism, and most profoundly with his own contributions to architecture. The Swiss artisan Jeanneret no longer existed. He had recreated himself as "Le Corbusier," the Parisian leader of the revolution in modern architecture.

Like other "men from the provinces" who settled in Paris, Le Corbusier identified himself completely with the capital and its values. Wright had hoped that decentralization would preserve the social value he prized most highly – individuality. Le Corbusier placed a corresponding faith in organization, and he foresaw a very different fate for modern society. For him, industrialization meant great cities where large bureaucracies could coordinate production. Whereas Wright thought that existing cities were at least a hundred times too dense, Le Corbusier thought they were not dense enough. He proposed that large tracts in the center of Paris and other major cities be leveled. In place of the old buildings, geometrically arrayed skyscrapers of glass and steel would rise out of parks, gardens, and superhighways. These towers would be the command posts for their region. They would house a technocratic elite of planners, engineers, and intellectuals who would bring beauty and prosperity to the whole society. In his first version of the ideal city, Le Corbusier had the elite live in luxurious high-rise apartments close to the center; their subordinates were relegated to satellite cities at the outskirts. (In a later version everyone was to live in the high-rises.) Le Corbusier called his plan "'the Radiant City,' a city worthy of our time."

The plans of Howard, Wright and Le Corbusier can be summarized briefly, but the energy and resources necessary to carry them out can hardly be conceived. One might expect that the three ideal cities were destined to remain on paper. Yet as we shall see, their proposals have already reshaped many of the cities we now live in and may prove to be even more influential in the future.

The plans were effective because they spoke directly to hopes and fears that were widely shared. In particular, they reflected (1) the pervasive fear of and revulsion from the nineteenth-century metropolis; (2) the sense that modern technology had made possible exciting new urban forms; and (3) the great expectation that a revolutionary age of brotherhood and freedom was at hand.

Caught in our own urban crisis, we tend to romanticize the teeming cities of the turn of the century. To many of their inhabitants, however, they were frightening and unnatural phenomena. Their unprecedented size and vast, uprooted populations seemed to suggest the uncontrollable forces unleashed by the Industrial Revolution, and the chaos that occupied the center of modern life. Joseph Conrad eloquently expressed this feeling when he confessed to being haunted by the vision of a "monstrous town more populous than some continents and in its man-made might as if indifferent to heaven's frowns and smiles; a cruel devourer of the world's light. There was room enough there to place any

story, depth enough there for any passion, variety enough for any setting, darkness enough to bury five millions of lives."[1]

The monstrous proportions of the big city were relatively new, and thus all the more unsettling. In the first half of the nineteenth century the great European cities had overflowed their historic walls and fortifications. (The American cities, of course, never knew such limits.) Now boundless, the great cities expanded into the surrounding countryside with reckless speed, losing the coherent structure of a healthy organism. London grew in the nineteenth century from 900,000 to 4.5 million inhabitants; Paris in the same period quintupled its population, from 500,000 to 2.5 million residents. Berlin went from 190,000 to over 2 million, New York from 60,000 to 3.4 million. Chicago, a village in 1840, reached 1.7 million by the turn of the century.[2]

This explosive growth, which would have been difficult to accommodate under any circumstances, took place in an era of laissez-faire and feverish speculation. The cities lost the power to control their own growth. Instead, speculation – the blind force of chance and profit – determined urban structure. The cities were segregated by class, their traditional unifying centers first overwhelmed by the increase in population and then abandoned. Toward the end of the nineteenth century the residential balance between urban and rural areas began tipping, in an unprecedented degree, towards the great cities. When Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier began their work, they saw around them stagnation in the countryside, the depopulation of rural villages, and a crisis in even the old regional centers. First trade and then the most skilled and ambitious young people moved to the metropolis.

Some of these newcomers found the good life they had been seeking in attractive new middle-class neighborhoods, but most were caught in the endless rows of tenements that stretched for miles, interrupted only by factories or railroad yards. Whole families were crowded into one or two airless rooms fronting on narrow streets or filthy courtyards where sunlight never penetrated. In Berlin in 1900, for example, almost 50 percent of all families lived in tenement dwellings with only one small room and an even smaller kitchen. Most of the rest lived in apartments with two tiny rooms and a kitchen, but to pay their rent some of these had to take in boarders who slept in the corners.[3] "Look at the cities of the nineteenth century," wrote Le Corbusier, "at the vast stretches covered with the crust of houses without heart and furrowed with streets without soul. Look, judge. These are the signs of a tragic denaturalization of human labor."[4]

Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier hated the cities of their time with an overwhelming passion. The metropolis was the counterimage of their ideal cities, the hell that inspired their heavens. They saw precious resources, material and human, squandered in the urban disorder. They were especially fearful that the metropolis would attract and then

consume all the healthful forces in society. All three visualized the great city as a cancer, an uncontrolled, malignant growth that was poisoning the modern world. Wright remarked that the plan of a large city resembled "the cross-section of a fibrous tumor"; Howard compared it to an enlarged ulcer. Le Corbusier was fond of picturing Paris as a body in the last stages of a fatal disease – its circulation clogged, its tissues dying of their own noxious wastes.

The three planners, moreover, used their insight into technology to go beyond a merely negative critique of the nineteenth-century metropolis. They showed how modern techniques of construction had created a new mastery of space from which innovative urban forms could be built. The great city, they argued, was no longer modern. Its chaotic concentration was not only inefficient and inhumane, it was unnecessary as well.

Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier based their ideas on the technological innovations that inspired their age: the express train, the automobile, the telephone and radio, and the skyscraper. Howard realized that the railroad system that had contributed to the growth of the great cities could serve the planned decentralization of society equally well. Wright understood that the personal automobile and an elaborate network of roads could create the conditions for an even more radical decentralization. Le Corbusier looked to technology to promote an opposite trend. He made use of the skyscraper as a kind of vertical street, a "street in the air" as he called it, which would permit intensive urban densities while eliminating the "soulless streets" of the old city.

The three planners' fascination with technology was deep but highly selective. They acknowledged only what served their own social values. Modern technology, they believed, had outstripped the antiquated social order, and the result was chaos and strife. In their ideal cities, however, technology would fulfill its proper role. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier believed that industrial society was inherently harmonious. It had an inherent structure, an ideal form, which, when achieved, would banish conflict and bring order and freedom, prosperity and beauty.

This belief went far beyond what could be deduced from the order and power of technology itself. It reflected instead the revolutionary hopes of the nineteenth century. For the three planners, as for so many of their contemporaries, the conflicts of the early Industrial Revolution were only a time of troubles that would lead inevitably to the new era of harmony. History for them was still the history of progress; indeed, as Howard put it, there was a "grand purpose behind nature." These great expectations, so difficult for us to comprehend, pervaded nineteenth-century radical and even liberal thought. There were many prophets of progress who contributed to creating the optimistic climate of opinion in which Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier formed their own beliefs. Perhaps the most relevant for our purposes were the "utopian socialists" of the early nineteenth century.

These reformers, most notably Charles Fourier, Robert Owen, and Henri de Saint-Simon, drew upon the tradition of Thomas More's *Utopia* and Plato's *Republic* to create detailed depictions of communities untainted by the class struggles of the Industrial Revolution. Unlike More or Plato, however, the utopian socialists looked forward to the immediate realization of their ideal commonwealths. Owen and Fourier produced detailed plans for building utopian communities, plans for social and architectural revolution that anticipated some of the work of Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier. Two themes dominated utopian socialist planning: first, a desire to overcome the distinction between city and country; and second, a desire to overcome the physical isolation of individuals and families by grouping the community into one large "family" structure. Most of the designs envisioned not ideal cities but ideal communes, small rural establishments for less than two thousand people. Owen put forward a plan for brick quadrangles, which he called "moral quadrilaterals." One side was a model factory, while the other three were taken up with a communal dining room, meeting rooms for recreation, and apartments.[5] His French rival Fourier advanced a far more elaborate design for a communal palace or "phalanstery," which boasted theaters, fashionable promenades, gardens, and gourmet cuisine for everyone.[6]

The utopian socialists were largely forgotten by the time Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier began their own work, so there was little direct influence from them. As we shall see, however, the search of each planner for a city whose design expressed the ideals of cooperation and social justice led him to revive many of the themes of his utopian socialist (and even earlier) predecessors. But one crucial element sharply separates the three planners' designs from all previous efforts. Even the most fantastic inventions of an Owen or a Fourier could not anticipate the new forms that twentieth-century technology would bring to urban design. The utopian socialists' prophecies of the future had to be expressed in the traditional architectural vocabulary. Fourier, for example, housed his cooperative community in a "phalanstery" that looked like the château of Versailles. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier were able to incorporate the scale and pace of the modern world into their designs. They worked at the dawn of the twentieth-century industrial era, but before the coming of twentieth-century disillusionment. Their imaginations were wholly modern; yet the coming era of cooperation was as real to them as it had been for Robert Owen. Their ideal cities thus stand at the intersection of nineteenth-century hopes and twentieth-century technology.

The three ideal cities, therefore, possessed a unique scope and fervor, but this uniqueness had its dangers. It effectively isolated the three planners from almost all the social movements and institutions of their time. In particular, it separated them from the members of two groups who might have been their natural allies, the Marxian socialists and the

professional planners. The three ideal cities were at once too technical for the Marxists and too revolutionary for the growing corps of professional planners. The latter was especially intent on discouraging any suggestion that urban planning might serve the cause of social change. These architect-administrators confined themselves to "technical" problems, which meant, in practice, serving the needs of society – as society's rulers defined them. Baron Haussmann, that model of an administrative planner, had ignored and sometimes worsened the plight of the poor in his massive reconstructions of Paris undertaken for Louis Napoleon. But the plight of the poor was not his administrative responsibility. He wanted to unite the isolated sectors of the city and thus quicken the pace of commerce. The wide avenues he cut through Paris were also designed to contribute to the prestige of the regime and, if necessary, to serve as efficient conduits for troops to put down urban disorders. Haussmann's physically impressive and socially reactionary plans inspired worldwide imitation and further increased the gap between urban design and social purpose.[7]

Even the middle-class reformers who specifically dedicated themselves to housing and urban improvement were unable to close this gap. Men like Sir Edwin Chadwick in London bravely faced official indifference and corruption to bring clean air, adequate sanitation, and minimal standards of housing to the industrial cities. Yet these philanthropists were also deeply conservative in their social beliefs. Their rare attempts at innovation almost always assumed the continued poverty of the poor and the privileges of the rich. The model tenements, "cheap cottages," and factory towns that were commissioned in the second half of the nineteenth century were filled with good intentions and sound planning, but they never failed to reflect the inequities of the society that built them. When, for example, the English housing reformer Octavia Hill built her model tenements, she kept accommodations to a minimum so that her indigent tenants could pay rents sufficient not only to cover the complete cost of construction but also to yield her wealthy backers 5 percent annual interest on the money they had advanced her.[8] (This kind of charitable enterprise was known as "philanthropy at 5 percent.") Not surprisingly, designs put forward under these conditions were almost as bleak as the slums they replaced.

Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier were not interested in making existing cities more profitable or in building "model" tenements to replace the old ones. These views might have been expected to have attracted the sympathetic attention of the Marxian socialists who then controlled the most powerful European movements for social change. Indeed, the *Communist Manifesto* had already recognized the necessity for radical structural change in the industrial cities by putting the "gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country" among its demands. Nevertheless, the socialist movement in the second half of the

nineteenth century turned away from what its leaders regarded as unprofitable speculation. In an important series of articles collected under the title *The Housing Question* (1872), Friedrich Engels maintained that urban design was part of the "superstructure" of capitalist society and would necessarily reflect that society's inhumanities, at least until after the socialist revolution had succeeded in transforming the economic base. He concluded that any attempt to envision an ideal city without waiting for the revolution was futile and, indeed, that any attempt to improve the cities significantly was doomed so long as capitalism endured. The working class must forget attractive visions of the future and concentrate on immediate revolution, after which the dictatorship of the proletariat would redistribute housing in the old industrial cities according to need. Then and only then could planners begin to think about a better kind of city.[9]

Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier could therefore look neither to the socialists nor to the professional planners for support. Initially, at least, they were forced back upon themselves. Instead of developing their ideas through collaboration with others and through practical experience, they worked in isolation on more and more elaborate models of their basic ideas. Their ideal cities thus acquired a wealth of brilliant detail and a single-minded theoretical rigor that made them unique. This isolation was no doubt the necessary precondition for the three planners' highly individual styles of social thought. Certainly their mercurial and independent careers showed a very different pattern from the solid institutional connections of, for example, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe or Walter Gropius. Mies, Gropius, and the other Bauhaus architects were also deeply concerned with the question of design and society; yet none of them produced an ideal city. They had more practical but also more limited projects to occupy them.[10] The ideal city is the genre of the outsider who travels at one leap from complete powerlessness to imaginary omnipotence.

This isolation encouraged Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier to extend their intellectual and imaginative capacities to their limits, but it also burdened their plans with almost insurmountable problems of both thought and action. They had created plans that were works of art, but the city, in Claude Lévi-Strauss's phrase, is a "*social* work of art." Its densely interwoven structure is the product of thousands of minds and thousands of individual decisions. Its variety derives from the unexpected juxtapositions and the unpredictable interactions. How can a single individual, even a man of genius, hope to comprehend this structure? And how can he devise a new plan with the same satisfying complexities? For his design, whatever its logic and merits, is necessarily his alone. In imposing a single point of view, he inevitably simplifies the parts that make up the whole. Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier each filled his ideal city with *his* buildings; *his* sense of proportion and color; and, most

profoundly, *his* social values. Would there ever be room for anyone else? The three ideal cities raise what is perhaps the most perplexing question for any planner: in attempting to create a new urban order, must he repress precisely that complexity, diversity, and individuality that are the city's highest achievements?

The problem of action was equally obvious and pressing. Deprived of outside support, the three planners came to believe that their ideas were inherently powerful. As technical solutions to urban problems and embodiments of justice and beauty, the three ideal cities could properly claim everyone's support. By holding up a ready-made plan for a new order, Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier hoped to create their own movements. This strategy, however, led directly to the classic utopian dilemma. To appeal to everyone on the basis of universal principles is to appeal to no one in particular. The more glorious the plans are in theory, the more remote they are from the concrete issues that actually motivate action. With each elaboration and clarification, the ideal cities move closer to pure fantasy. Can imagination alone change the world? Or, as Friedrich Engels phrased the question: How can the isolated individual hope to *impose his idea* on history?

These two related problems of thought and action confronted Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier throughout their careers; yet they never doubted that ultimately they could solve both. Each believed that if a planner based his work on the structure inherent in industrial society and on the deepest values of his culture, there could be no real conflict between his plan and individual liberty. Patiently, each searched for that harmonious balance between control and freedom: the order that does not repress but liberates the individual.

With equal determination, they sought a valid strategy for action. Their ideal cities, they knew, could never be constructed all at once. But at least a "working model" could be begun, even in the midst of the old society. This model would demonstrate both the superiority of their architectural principles and also serve as a symbol of the new society about to be born. Its success would inspire emulation. A movement of reconstruction would take on momentum and become a revolutionary force in itself. Rebuilding the cities could thus become, in a metaphor all three favored, the "Master Key" that would unlock the way to a just society.

The three planners, therefore, looked to the new century with confidence and hope. Against the overwhelming power of the great cities and the old order that built them, Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier advanced their designs for planned growth, for the reassertion of the common interest and higher values, for a healthy balance between man's creation and the natural environment. It would seem to be an uneven contest. Nevertheless, the three planners still believed that an individual and his imagination could change history. The revolution they were

seeking was precisely an assertion of human rationality over vast impersonal forces. They resolved that in the coming era of reconciliation and construction, the man of imagination must play a crucial role. He would embody the values of his society in a workable plan and thus direct social change with his prophetic leadership. For Howard, Wright, and Le Corbusier, this next revolution would finally bring imagination to power. "What gives our dreams their daring," Le Corbusier proclaimed, "is that they can be achieved."[11]

Ebenezer Howard

The ideal city made practicable

> Town and country *must be married,* and out of this joyous union will spring a new hope, a new life, a new civilization.
>
> Ebenezer Howard (1898)

Of the three planners discussed here, Ebenezer Howard is the least known and the most influential. His *To-morrow: a Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (1898, now known under the title of the 1902 edition, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*) has, as Lewis Mumford acknowledged, "done more than any other single book to guide the modern town planning movement and to alter its objectives."[12] And Howard was more than a theoretician. He and his supporters founded two English cities, Letchworth (1903) and Welwyn (1920), which still serve as models for his ideas. More important, he was able to organize a city planning movement that continues to keep his theories alive. The postwar program of New Towns in Great Britain, perhaps the most ambitious of all attempts at national planning, was inspired by his works and planned by his followers.

In the United States the "Greenbelt Cities" undertaken by the Resettlement Administration in the 1930s owed their form to the example of the Garden City. The best recent example of an American New Town is Columbia, Maryland, built in the 1960s as a wholly independent community with houses and industry. In 1969 the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy urged that the United States undertake to build 110 New Towns to accommodate 20 million citizens.[13] The following year, Congress created a New Town Corporation in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to begin this vast task.[14] So far, sixteen American New Towns have either been planned or are under construction. The most fruitful period of Ebenezer Howard's influence is perhaps only beginning.

If Howard's achievements continue to grow in importance, Howard the man remains virtually unknown. The present-day New Town planners

are perhaps a little embarrassed by him. They are highly skilled professional bureaucrats or architects; Howard's formal education ended at fourteen, and he had no special training in architecture or urban design. The modern planners are self-proclaimed "technicians" who have attempted to adapt the New Town concept to any established social order. Howard was, in his quiet way, a revolutionary who originally conceived the Garden City as a means of superseding capitalism and creating a civilization based on cooperation. Howard's successors have neglected this aspect of his thought, and without it the founder of the Garden City movement becomes an elusive figure indeed. He shrank from the personal publicity that Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier so eagerly and skillfully sought. Throughout his life he maintained the habits and the appearance of a minor clerk. He once said that he enjoyed his chosen profession, stenography, because it enabled him to be an almost invisible observer at the notable events he recorded. Even at the meetings of the association he headed, he preferred to sit in an inconspicuous position behind the podium, where he could take down the exact words of the other speakers. Frederic J. Osborn, one of his closest associates, remembered him as "the sort of man who could easily pass unnoticed in a crowd."[15] He was, Osborn added, "the mildest and most unassuming of men . . . universally liked, and notably by children."[16]

Nonetheless, Howard succeeded where more charismatic figures failed. In 1898 he had to borrow fifty pounds to print *To-morrow* at his own expense. Five years later his supporters were advancing more than £100,000 to begin the construction of the first Garden City. The rapidity of this turn of events surprised Howard and is still difficult to explain. The root of the mystery is Howard himself. He had reached middle age before beginning his work on city planning and had never given any indication that he was capable of originality or leadership. His book, however, was a remarkable intellectual achievement. He concisely and rigorously outlined a new direction for the development of cities and advanced practical solutions that covered the whole range of city planning problems: land use, design, transportation, housing, and finance. At the same time, he incorporated these ideas into a large synthesis: a plan for a complete alternative society and a program for attaining it.

Howard, moreover, proved to be a surprisingly effective organizer. He was an indefatigable worker who bent with slavelike devotion to the task of promoting his own ideas. At cooperative societies, Labour Churches, settlement houses, temperance unions, debating clubs – at any group that would pay his railroad fares and provide a night's hospitality – he preached the "Gospel of the Garden City" under the title "The Ideal City Made Practicable, A Lecture Illustrated with Lantern Slides." He possessed a powerful speaking voice, and, more important, he was able to communicate an overwhelming sense of earnestness, an absolute conviction that he had discovered "the peaceful path to real reform."

Mankind, he proclaimed, was moving inevitably toward a new era of brotherhood, and the Garden City would be the only fitting environment for the humanity of the future. His original supporters were not planners or architects but social reformers whose own dreams he promised would be realized in the Garden City. Patiently, he assembled a broad coalition of backers ranging from "Back to the Land" agrarians to George Bernard Shaw. Working constantly himself, he felt free to draw upon the resources and talents of others. He thus made his ideas the basis of a movement that, fifty years after his death, continues to grow. As one of Shaw's characters in *Major Barbara* observes, absolute unselfishness is capable of anything.

Inventing the Garden City

Howard never called himself a planner. His activities can be described in many words – theorist, organizer, publicist, city founder – and yet he always preferred to describe himself as an inventor. He was, he proudly proclaimed, the "inventor of the Garden City idea." The term is both appropriate and significant. In an image dear to the nineteenth century, Howard saw himself as one of those dreamers and backyard tinkerers who emerge from obscurity with one great idea, brave neglect and ridicule from the "practical" world, and finally see the skeptics confounded and the invention become an integral part of a better world. Howard in his moments of triumph was fond of comparing himself with George Stephenson, the self-taught engineer who built the first practical locomotive. The Garden City, he hoped, would be an equally significant innovation, revolutionary in itself and, like the early locomotive, capable of great improvement. It would be an engine of progress with the ability to unlock social energy and move society towards beneficent ends which even its inventor could not foresee.

The term "inventor" had one other meaning for him. As a devoted admirer of the great inventors and an occasional practitioner himself, he knew that the most important inventions were rarely the most original. They were, rather, uniquely serviceable applications of ideas that were already well known. This was precisely what Howard claimed for his innovation. In language borrowed from patent office applications he described the Garden City as a "unique combination of Proposals" that were already before the public. Howard was being truthful as well as modest. One can easily demonstrate that almost every aspect of the Garden City was borrowed from other schemes that were in existence at the time Howard began his work, some for the decentralization of cities, some for the democratization of wealth and power. This, however, would be to miss the point of Howard's achievement, for he alone saw the connection between the diverse ideas that went into his plan. With the ingenuity and patience of an inventor putting together a useful new

machine out of parts forged for other purposes, Howard created a coherent design for a new environment and a new society.

Howard was able to assemble the disparate elements of the Garden City so successfully because he had a firm set of unquestioned beliefs that guided his actions. Unlike Wright and Le Corbusier, who were always emphasizing their own uniqueness, Howard was a remarkably typical product of his milieu. This prophet of decentralization was born in the center of London in 1850; his parents ran a small shop in the city. He left school at fourteen to become a junior clerk in a stockbroker's office. To better his prospects he taught himself the new Pitman system of shorthand and set up shop on his own.[17] He thus raised himself from the bottom of the hierarchy of clerkdom and joined that group of "little men" – petty entrepreneurs, commission salesmen, shopkeepers – who struggled to maintain a proud independence in the era before large organizations absorbed the white-collar class.

This success, however, never satisfied him. For Howard was touched by the great expectations of the nineteenth century. He wanted to contribute to the "unexampled rate of progress and invention" that he believed characterized his times. He started to tinker with gadgets: a keyless watch, a breech-loading gun, a typewriter that automatically allotted to each letter the space it occupied in print typography.[18] These projects, never successful, absorbed his attention and his ready cash. In his most unusual attempt to make his fortune he emigrated briefly to the United States, where a year spent as a homesteader in Nebraska convinced him of the virtues of stenography. He returned to London in 1876.[19]

After this episode his ambitions took a less material turn. While struggling to build up his stenography practice, he grew preoccupied with what was then called "the Social Question" – the origins and causes of all the poverty that daily surrounded him. Perhaps his own failure and temporary poverty in the United States had awakened his sympathy for the poor in his own country. The principles of moral duty he had learned in Sunday school and his own innate kindliness surely also played their part. In any case, he soon joined a series of reading and discussion groups with names like the "Zetetical Society." For him and the other members, these groups represented an opportunity to educate themselves in the great political and economic questions of the day. Together they taught themselves John Stuart Mill on political economy, Herbert Spencer on social science, Darwin and Huxley on evolution. There he met high-minded men and women with concerns similar to his own and was initiated into the world of middle-class London radicalism.

These genteel revolutionaries have rarely been appreciated or even understood in our time. They were amateurs and idealists in a field that has come to be dominated by professionals and politicians. Their plans for reconstructing society survive only in the pages of old pamphlets with

titles in ornate type: *Brotherhood, Cooperation.* Photographs in these pamphlets show us their faces, which have no elegance and little humor but much hope and integrity; the men are in stiff white collars, the women in severely buttoned dresses. Under each picture is an identifying caption: "Secretary, Temperance Union and Cooperative Society" or "Spiritualist and Social Reformer." The Radicals had more than their share of cranks, but their movement was the home of much that was most humane in nineteenth-century British society, as well as the source of much that would prove most fruitful for the twentieth century. When Howard designed the Garden City in the 1890s, he followed unhesitatingly the social ideals he had learned as an obscure Radical of the 1870s and 1880s.

The Radicals believed that Victorian England was not the best of all possible worlds; that the economic life of the nation was corrupt, inhumane, inefficient, and immoral; and that political power, despite the appearance of democracy, was unjustly concentrated in the hands of a few. This concentration, they feared, would ruin the nation if allowed to continue. In the countryside the near-monopoly of landholding by large owners was bankrupting agriculture. Farm workers, deprived of any hope of owning their own land, were fleeing the land and swelling the urban slums. There they were easily exploited by "sweating" employers, whose sharp practices and monopolistic tactics were driving the honest "little person" out of business. If these trends were to continue, the result would be a society polarized between capital and labor. The Radicals were not Marxists, so they saw in this last prospect only violent conflict that would destroy both sides.

Their remedies for this dismal situation were democracy and cooperation. They wanted first to break the power of the landed gentry who controlled Parliament and to institute a thoroughgoing land reform. This would draw farm workers back from the slums and create a new class of yeoman smallholders, prosperous and independent. For the urban industrialized areas, the Radicals called for cooperation to replace large-scale capitalism. Profit sharing in production would gradually erase the distinction between worker and employer, thus ending class conflict. At the same time, cooperative stores would end profiteering and wasteful anarchy in distribution.

The Radicals devoutly believed in progress, and they held that humankind was evolving toward a higher stage of social organization – the cooperative commonwealth – in which brotherhood would become the basis of daily life. But while they were sure that humankind was capable of creating this better world, they had no definite strategy for achieving their goal. They rejected what were to be the two great engines of social change, government intervention and the labor movement. They rejected big government as a dangerous concentration of power, even if it were on their side. For the Radicals, independence

and voluntary action were both means and ends. Nor did they support organizing the working class. As we have seen, they regarded class struggle as one of the evils of modern society.

Without a plan of action, the Radical movement alternated between long periods of discussion and short bursts of activity when the true path seemed to be found. One such burst accompanied the arrival in London in 1884 of Henry George, the American reformer whose proposal for a "single tax" of 100 percent of all rental income would, in effect, accomplish the Radical program of land reform at a stroke. George's ideas left their imprint on the Radical movement in general and, as we shall see, on Howard in particular, but they failed to win over the British electorate, and the enthusiasm subsided. Sometimes individuals or small groups would abandon their homes and businesses to form utopian colonies like Topolobampo in Mexico. There they hoped to create a "working model" of true cooperation to win over a skeptical world.

More frequently, the Radicals allowed themselves to hope that their small-scale cooperative enterprises might, through voluntary action alone, supplant their profit-making competitors. If the Trusts had grown great on the force of selfishness, why should not brotherhood prove even more powerful? Cooperative socialism could then prevail without any legislation. A good example of these hopes – and illusions – was a scheme propounded by two friends of Howard's, J. Bruce Wallace and the Reverend Bruce Campbell, to bring cooperative workshops and stores to the slum dwellers of London's East End. At the beginning of 1894 the co-ops, aptly named the Brotherhood Trust, had enrolled over one hundred customers. "Suppose," Wallace urged his supporters on February 1, 1894, "suppose one fresh customer gained monthly for every old customer." After some rapid calculations he was able to announce that by February 1, 1896, they would have over one hundred million enrolled. "In the third year the trade of the whole world would be in the hands of the Trust, for fraternal purposes."[20]

Wallace was quick to add: "I am not so sanguine as to believe that our little movement will actually spread with such rapidity."[21] Nevertheless, it was a revealing fantasy, the dream of a "little man" that his modest enterprise might one day change the world – without coercion. Slightly transposed, it was the same as an inventor's dream of worldwide success by virtue of having created a superior product. As we shall see, Howard's conception of the Garden City as "the peaceful path to real reform" combined elements of both dreams.

Throughout the 1880s, Howard continued to absorb both the principles and the problems of the Radical movement. He remained a follower, emerging from anonymity only once to deliver a speech on spiritualism at the Zetetical Society. His cogitations on interplanetary ether waves as the possible physical basis of spiritualist communication gave no hint of his coming concerns.[22] His period of quiescence ended

suddenly, however, in 1888 with a single event that made him an activist for the rest of his life: he read Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*. Published in Boston in 1888, *Looking Backward* had won immediate popularity in the United States and exercised a profound influence over such men as Thorstein Veblen and John Dewey.[23] Written against the background of the industrial depression and growing labor unrest that engulfed both America and Europe in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the book presented a graphic depiction of a society in which these problems had been overcome. The hero of the novel is a prosperous Bostonian who has the good fortune to sleep soundly from 1887 to 2000 and wake in a society organized on moral principles. Industry has been efficiently grouped into one government-owned cooperative Trust. Distribution has also been concentrated into one great Department Store, whose branches in every city and village sell everything the nation has produced. Competition has been replaced by centralized planning; poverty and unemployment are unknown; all citizens between twenty-one and forty-five occupy ranks in the "industrial army," and everyone receives an equal salary.

Although Bellamy's novel was only one of the genre of "utopian romances" that seemed as ubiquitous in their time as murder mysteries are in ours, it was by far the most effective in its critique of industrial capitalism and its imaginative demonstration that a better alternative could exist. *Looking Backward* was sent to Howard by an American friend. He read it at one sitting and was "fairly carried away." The next morning, as he later wrote

> *I went into some of the crowded parts of London, and as I passed through the narrow dark streets, saw the wretched dwellings in which the majority of the people lived, observed on every hand the manifestations of a self-seeking order of society and reflected on the absolute unsoundness of our economic system, there came to me an overpowering sense of the temporary nature of all I saw, and of its entire unsuitability for the working life of the new order – the order of justice, unity and friendliness.*[24]

Howard was sufficiently enthusiastic to believe that many others would share his revelation. He was especially impressed with Bellamy's use of an imaginative portrayal of an alternative to demonstrate the "absolute unsoundness and quite transitory nature" of existing society. In the absence of any other viable movement for change, Bellamy's vision of a better future could become the standard around which men of goodwill would unite. Howard claimed that he was responsible for persuading an English firm to publish *Looking Backward* in London in 1889.[25] In imitation of the Bellamy Clubs then forming in the United States, Howard soon began meeting with small groups to discuss Bellamy's ideas. In 1890 he participated in the formation of the

English Nationalization of Labour Society, the counterpart of Bellamy's Nationalization Party in the United States.[26]

As *Looking Backward* won an enthusiastic readership in English Radical circles, Howard allowed himself the belief that the Nationalization movement was the plan for action the Radicals had been seeking. Even at the time of his greatest hope, however, he could not believe that the movement would have the power to take over the industry of Great Britain very soon. "This perception, naturally, led me to put forward proposals for testing Mr. Bellamy's principles, though on a much smaller scale."[27] Howard began to devise a model community of a few thousand people in which – as in *Looking Backward* – everyone would be employed by the community, whose directors would run every enterprise. If successful, this project would prove the efficacy of Bellamy's ideas to those who would not be moved by purely literary arguments, and thus speed the day when nationalization could occur on a national scale.

Characteristically, Howard's maiden attempt at planning was not an attempt to advance his own ideas but to adapt those of another. Nonetheless, as Howard began to work on the scheme, he came to realize that Bellamy's novelistic gifts had blinded him to the differences between his own goals and those advanced in *Looking Backward*. For Howard shared the Radical mistrust of all concentrations of power, whereas Bellamy made centralization the key to his reforms. Howard saw more clearly than many other readers that behind Bellamy's faith in control from above there was a strong authoritarian bias. Bellamy proudly compared his "industrial army" to the Prussian army. As for its leaders, he spoke grandly and vaguely of a small corps of managers who could plan the economy of the United States or any other nation in the year 2000. In his system, he claimed, the management of all American industry would be "so simple, and depending on principles so obvious and easily applied, that the functionaries at Washington to whom it is trusted require to be nothing more than men of fair ability."[28] Although Bellamy was realistic about the likely intelligence of the bureaucrats of the future, he had unlimited faith in their efficacy, a faith that Howard could not share. Bellamy had seized upon all the forces of concentration and centralization in late-nineteenth-century society and saw in them the possibility for a more humane order. Not only did Howard doubt the practicality of extreme centralization, but he also denied its desirability even if it could work.

Howard continued to work out the plan of a model community; now, however, it was designed to put forward and test his own ideas. The Garden City was not the simple result of Bellamy's influence on Howard. Rather, it grew out of Howard's attempt to correct Bellamy's authoritarian bias and to devise a community in which social order and individual initiative would be properly balanced.

He began with Bellamy's plan for "nationalization," the concept that

the entire productive capacity of a nation could be managed as it if were one huge Trust, and all its stores and shops controlled as if they were branches of one great Department Store. In thinking about his own model community, Howard was particularly aware of the problems connected with farming. His own failure as a farmer had sufficiently sensitized him to the difficulties in that area, and he doubted that even a small community could successfully manage all its farms. He had, moreover, followed the decline of the Radical utopian colony in Mexico, Topolobampo, whose directors had controlled all productive activity. Their attempts at management had merely focused all the dissatisfactions of the colony on themselves and destroyed the experiment. Howard proposed, therefore, what would become the policy of the Garden City: that the community include both privately and collectively owned enterprise and leave to the citizens the choice of how they wished to work.

From this, Howard proceeded to an even more significant transformation: a critique of Bellamy's ideal of centralization. Bellamy believed that the industrial society of the future ought to be controlled by bureaucrats working from their command posts in the great cities. In opposing nationalization, Howard also began questioning the inevitability of centralization. Specifically, he began to modify his original view that the community he was designing was only a scale model of the centralized society of the future. Was the balance of individual society he was seeking possible in the metropolis? Or did the small decentralized community have an inherent value of its own?

In wrestling with this question, Howard was no doubt influenced by Peter Kropotkin, a Russian anarchist whose articles appeared in the widely read London journal *The Nineteenth Century* between 1888 and 1890.[29] These articles, later collected as *Fields, Factories, and Workshops* (1899), argued that while steam energy and the railroads had brought large factories and great cities, the dawning age of electricity would make possible a rapid decentralization. He saw the future in what he called "industrial villages," twentieth-century versions of the old crafts villages of the preindustrial era. There electrically powered, cooperatively owned cottage industries would turn out goods more efficiently than the old urban factories, while the workers' homes and gardens would be nestled in unspoiled countryside.

Kropotkin's views found a deep response in English Radical circles, especially his prediction that all the great urban concentrations of people and power were destined to disappear; his conviction that the future belonged to small-scale cooperators; and his belief that decentralization would make possible a society based on liberty and brotherhood. Howard, who called Kropotkin "the greatest democrat ever born to wealth and power,"[30] decisively abandoned his temporary infatuation with the centralized schemes of Edward Bellamy. Kropotkin had called

his attention to the crucial importance of *scale* as a factor in social theory. "On a small scale," Howard proposed, "society may readily become more individualistic than now and more socialistic."[31] Conversely, he came to realize that the great city could never become the home of the co-operative civilization he was seeking. He was now ready to formulate the fundamental principle of the Garden City: *Radical hopes for a cooperative civilization could be fulfilled only in small communities embedded in a decentralized society.*

Howard thus turned to decentralization as a means of action, a way of voting with one's feet against the concentration of power and wealth that the cities represented. His anti-urbanism had nothing in common with the vague longings for a more natural life propagated by the "Back to the Land" movement, which was then enjoying one of its periodic revivals. He loved the excitement of London and deeply valued the social qualities of the great cities.[32] It was their economic and political role that disturbed him. "Palatial edifices and fearful slums are the strange, complementary features of modern cities."[33] Howard's identification of the metropolis with the extremes of wealth and power was the starting point of his analysis of the modern city and the real source of his antagonism toward it. He realized that the concentration of wealth and misery in the city would require an equally vast concentration of power to combat it. His favorite example of this was slum clearance. In a large city the inflated price of urban land and the vast numbers of slum dwellers meant that an effective program required a government with powers of taxation and confiscation that Howard, as a good Radical, shrank from even seeking. To accept the nineteenth-century metropolis as the inevitable context for modern life meant that either the force of vested interest would continue to prevail or an equally monstrous force based on class conflict would be raised to topple it.

Both alternatives affronted Howard's belief that mankind was moving to a higher stage of brotherhood. He drew the necessary conclusion: Large cities had no place in the society of the future. Surveying the "ill-ventilated, unplanned, unwieldy, and unhealthy cities – ulcers on the very face of our beautiful island,"[34] he proclaimed: "These crowded cities have done their work; they were the best which a society largely based on selfishness and rapacity could construct, but they are in the nature of things entirely unadapted for a society in which the social side of our nature is demanding a larger share of recognition."[35] Everything genuinely valuable in the social life of the city could and must be preserved in new communities designed so that the advantages of the town could be "married" to those of the country. "Human society and the beauty of nature are meant to be enjoyed together."[36] In communities of about 30,000 people based on small business and agriculture, everyone could enjoy the benefits of a healthy environment. Reduced to the scale of a Garden City, the gulf between capital and labor would be narrowed,

social problems would become amenable to cooperative solutions, and the proper balance of order and freedom could be achieved.

How could this great social transformation be achieved? Howard summed up his response in his diagram of the "Three Magnets." Town and country were compared to magnets, each with its particular drawing power, its particular combination of attraction and repulsion. The town, with its excitement, high wages, and employment opportunities, suffered from high prices and poor living conditions. The beauty of the countryside was vitiated by its economic backwardness and "lack of amusement." The task for the planner would be to create a third magnet, the Town-Country magnet, the new community, which would have high wages and low rents; beauty of nature but "plenty to do"; "bright homes and gardens" along with freedom and cooperation.

In the diagram, "The People" are poised like iron filings between the magnets. This aspect of the metaphor is unfortunate, for Howard's point is that people will respond freely and rationally to the environment that gives them the most advantages. No one had been drafted into the cities. The great migration from the countryside, which in Howard's lifetime had brought seven million rural residents to the British urban centers, occurred without legislative compulsion. Similarly, the great exodus from the city to which Howard looked would require no coercive power.

What it required was planning. The Town-Country magnet had to be created consciously to yield the combination of physical and social benefits that were promised. This task Howard took upon himself. Although he had no training in architecture or city planning, he did have the inventor's confidence that he could find the better way. Working alone in the time he could spare from his stenography practice, he set out to give the Radical movement not only a new goal but the strategy for action it had been lacking. Building new towns, creating a new environment – that was the way to the cooperative commonwealth. Howard strove patiently to design that Third Magnet he called the Garden City, whose promise of a better life would draw people away from the urban centers into a new civilization.

Design for cooperation

Between 1889 and 1892 Howard created the basic plan for his ideal community. He envisaged his Garden City as a tightly organized urban center for 30,000 inhabitants, surrounded by a perpetual "green belt" of farms and parks. Within the city there would be both quiet residential neighborhoods and facilities for a full range of commercial, industrial, and cultural activities. For Howard did not conceive the Garden City as a specialized "satellite town" or "bedroom town" perpetually serving some great metropolis. Rather, he foresaw the great cities of his time shrinking

to insignificance as their people deserted them for a new way of life in a decentralized society. No longer would a single metropolis dominate a whole region or even a whole nation. Nor would the palatial edifices and giant organizations of the big city continue to rule modern society. Instead, the urban population would be distributed among hundreds of Garden Cities whose small scale and diversity of functions embody a world in which the little person has finally won out.

Howard does not seem to have been familiar with the designs for geometric cities that utopian socialists had put forward earlier in the nineteenth century. Nonetheless the perfectly circular, perfectly symmetrical plan he devised for the Garden City bears a distinct resemblance to some of these, notably James Silk Buckingham's cast-iron Victoria (1849).[37] The explanation, however, lies not in direct influence but in shared values. For Howard had inherited that tradition in English utopian thought in which it was assumed that society could be improved just as a machine could – through the appropriate adjustments. A properly functioning society would thus take on the precise and well-calculated look of a good machine.

For Howard, therefore, there was nothing merely "mechanical" in the relentless symmetry of the Garden City. He wanted to make the design the physical embodiment of his ideal of cooperation, and he believed that his perfectly circular plan would best meet the needs of the citizens. He promised that every building would be "so placed to secure maximum utility and convenience."[38] This "unity of design and purpose" had been impossible in old cities formed, in Howard's view, by "an infinite number of small, narrow, and selfish decisions."[39] In the Garden City, however, an active common interest would make possible a uniform, comprehensive plan. With selfish obstructions removed, the city could assume that geometric form that Howard believed was the most efficient and the most beautiful. The symmetry of the Garden City would be the symbol and product of cooperation, the sign of a harmonious society.

The only relevant book he remembered reading was written by a physician, Dr Benjamin Richardson, and entitled *Hygeia, A City of Health*.[40] It was an imaginative presentation of the principles of public sanitation in which Dr Richardson depicted a city whose design would be the healthiest for its inhabitants. He prescribed a population density of twenty-five people per acre, a series of wide, tree-shaded avenues, and homes and public gardens surrounded by greenery. "Instead of the gutter the poorest child has the garden; for the foul sight and smell of unwholesome garbage, he has flowers and green sward."[41] Howard was happy to follow this prescription. The public health movement, of which Dr Richardson was a prominent representative, was a vital force for civic action; it had persuaded the public that there was a strong correlation between the health of a community and its political and moral soundness. Howard maintained that the Garden Cities would be the healthiest in the nation.

He incorporated the low population density, the wide avenues, and other features of *Hygeia* into the geometry of his own city.

The problem of health was especially important because Howard planned the Garden City to be a manufacturing center in which the factories would necessarily be close to the homes. In order to separate the residential areas and also to ensure that everyone would be within walking distance of the workplace, Howard put the factories at the periphery of the city, adjacent to the circular railroad that surrounds the town and connects it to the main line. Here one can find the enterprises appropriate to a decentralized society: the small machine shop, or the cooperative printing works, or the jam factory where the rural cooperative processes its members' fruits. As usual in the plan, physical location has a symbolic aspect. Industry has its place and its function, but these are at the outskirts of the community. Howard had little faith in the role of work – even if cooperatively organized – to provide the unifying force in society. This he left to leisure and civic enterprise.

There are two kinds of centers in the Garden City: the neighborhood centers and the (one) civic center. The neighborhoods, or "wards" as Howard called them, are slices in the circular pie. Each ward comprises one-sixth of the town, 5,000 people or about 1,000 families. Each, said Howard, "should in some sense be a complete town by itself" (he imagined the Garden City being built ward by ward).[42] The basic unit in the neighborhood is the family living in its own home surrounded by a garden. Howard hoped to be able to provide houses with gardens to all classes. Most residents would be able to afford a lot 20 by 130 feet; the most substantial homes would be arranged in crescents bordering Grand Avenue, a park and promenade that forms the center of the ward. In the middle of Grand Avenue is the most important neighborhood institution, the school. This, Howard commented, should be the first building constructed in each ward and will serve as a library, a meeting hall, and even as a site for religious worship. Churches, when they are built, also occupy sites in Grand Avenue.[43]

There are two cohesive forces that bring the residents out of their neighborhoods and unite the city. The first is leisure. The center of the town is a Central Park, which provides "ample recreation grounds within very easy access of all the people."[44] Surrounding the park is a glassed-in arcade, which Howard calls the "Crystal Palace": "Here manufactured goods are exposed for sale, and here most of that class of shopping which requires the joy of deliberation and selection is done."[45]

The Crystal Palace, in addition to providing an attractive setting for consumption, also permits the town, by granting or withholding leases, to exercise some control over distribution. Howard, as always, recommended a balance between individualism and central organization. He rejected the idea of one great cooperative department store run by the community, like the one in *Looking Backward*. Instead, he advocated that

there be many small shops, but only one for each category of goods. If customers complain that a merchant is abusing his monopoly, the town rents space in the Crystal Palace to another shopkeeper in the same field, whose competition then restores adequate service. Whatever the merits of this solution, it aptly reflects the Radical ambivalence toward the trades that supported so many of them, the desire for economic independence without the self-destructive competition that accompanied it.

Important as consumption and leisure were in his system, Howard nonetheless reserved the very center of the Central Park to the second cohesive force, "civil spirit." He wanted an impressive and meaningful setting for the "large public buildings": town hall, library, museum, concert and lecture hall, and the hospital. Here the highest values of the community are brought together – culture, philanthropy, health, and mutual cooperation.

We might wonder what kind of cultural life a Garden City of 30,000 could enjoy, but this question did not bother Howard. He never felt the need of that intensification of experience – the extremes of diversity and excellence – that only a metropolis can offer. We must also remember, however, that Howard lived in a milieu that did not look to others to provide entertainment or enlightenment. The English middle class and a sizable part of the working class created its own culture in thousands of voluntary groups: lecture societies, choral groups, drama guilds, chamber symphonies. Here, as elsewhere, Howard disdained the kind of centralization that focused the life of a nation on a few powerful metropolitan institutions. He looked to small-scale voluntary cooperation not only for the economic base of the community but also for its highest cultural attainments.

The Garden City occupies 1,000 acres in the middle of a tract of 5,000 acres reserved for farms and forests.[46] This "Agricultural Belt" plays an integral role in the economy of the Garden City; the 2,000 farmers who live there supply the town with the bulk of its food. Because transportation costs are almost nonexistent, the farmer receives a good price for his produce, and the consumer gets fresh vegetables and dairy products at a reduced price. The Agricultural Belt, moreover, prevents the town from sprawling out into the countryside and ensures that the citizens enjoy both a compact urban center and ample open countryside. "One of the first essential needs of Society and of the individual," wrote Howard, "is that every man, every woman, every child should have ample space in which to live, to move, and to develop."[47] He added a new element to the rights of man – the right to space.

The Garden City in all its aspects expressed Howard's ideal of a cooperative commonwealth. It was the Zion in which he and his fellow Radicals could be at ease, the environment in which all the Radical hopes could be realized. Yet the Garden City was more than an image of felicity for Howard had carefully wedded his vision of the ideal city to a

concrete plan for action. Indeed, he devoted relatively little attention to the details of the new city and a great deal to the means of achieving it. He wanted to show that there was no need to wait for a revolution to build the Garden City: it could be undertaken immediately by a coalition of Radical groups working within the capitalist system. The first successful Garden City would be a working model of a better society, and those that succeeded it would decisively alter English society. Building the Garden City was itself the revolution. The planned transformation of the environment was the nonviolent but effective strategy that the Radical movement had been seeking. The Garden City was, as Howard put it, "the peaceful path to real reform."

Howard wanted the building of the first Garden City to be an example of voluntary cooperation, and he devoted most of his book to outlining and defending his method. The key to Howard's strategy was his contention that building a new city could be *practical*, i.e., that money advanced for its construction could be paid back with interest. Funds could thus be solicited from high-minded and thrifty Radicals with the assurance that they would be both helping the cause and earning a modest return for themselves. The germ of Howard's scheme could be found in an article written in 1884 by the distinguished economist Alfred Marshall.[48] Marshall had pointed out that the rail networks that covered Great Britain rendered the concentration of so many businesses in London economically irrational. Many businesses could be carried out far more cheaply, efficiently, and pleasantly where land was inexpensive and abundant. Marshall proposed that committees be established to buy up suitable land outside London and coordinate the movement of factories and working people. The value of the land in these new industrial parks would rise sharply, and the committees that owned them would reap a handsome profit.

Howard, who knew both the proposal and its author,[49] took up this suggestion and transformed it to suit his own ends. He began by asking the reader to assume that a group of his supporters – "gentlemen of responsible position and undoubted probity and honor," as he hopefully described them – had banded together to form a nonprofit company. They would raise money by issuing bonds yielding a fixed rate (4 or 5 percent), purchase 6,000 acres of agricultural land, and lay out a city according to Howard's plans. They would build roads, power and water plants, and all other necessities, and then seek to attract industry and residents. The company would continue to own all the land; as the population rose, the rents too would rise from the low rate per acre for agricultural land to the more substantial rate of a city with 30,000 residents. All rent would go to the company and would be used to repay the original investors. Any surplus that remained after the financial obligations had been discharged would provide additional services to the community.[50]

Howard proposed, in other words, that the Garden City be founded and financed by philanthropic land speculation. The scheme was speculative because it was a gamble on the rise in values that would result from attracting 30,000 people to a plot of empty farmland, and philanthropic because the speculators agreed in advance to forgo all but a fixed portion of the expected profits. The concept was not original with Howard. "Philanthropy at 5 percent" was a familiar feature in English reform circles, and activists from the Owenites to the Christian Socialists made use of fixed-dividend corporations to raise money for cooperative stores and workshops. The Reverend Charles Kingsley, a Christian Socialist, aptly illustrated the spirit of this reconciliation of God and Mammon when he exhorted his followers to "seek first the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness with this money of yours and see if all things – profits and suchlike – are not added unto you."[51]

Howard did add a new emphasis to this method. He stipulated that part of the rental income each year be placed in a sinking fund and used to purchase the bonds of the original investors. As the number of bondholders decreased, the amount that the company had to pay each year to the ones remaining would also decrease. Meanwhile, income from rents would be constantly growing as the town grew; the surplus, as we have seen, was earmarked for community services. Eventually the Garden City would buy out all the original investors, and the entire income from rents could be used to benefit the citizens. Taxes would be unnecessary; rents alone would generously support schools, hospitals, cultural institutions, and charities.[52]

The residents of the Garden City would thus continue to pay rent, but landlords would be eliminated. The private ownership of land for the benefit of individuals would be replaced by collective ownership for the benefit of the community. Howard placed tremendous emphasis on this change. He, like almost every other Radical, believed that the "land question" – the concentration of the ownership of land in Great Britain in the hands of a few – was, as he put it, the "root of all our problems."[53] As late as 1873 an official survey had shown that 80 percent of the land in the United Kingdom was owned by less than 7,000 persons.[54] The spread of Garden Cities would transfer land ownership on a large scale from individuals to the community, thus inaugurating an economic and social revolution.

Howard's analysis of the crucial importance of the "land question" derived from the writings of the American reformer Henry George, a hero of English Radicals in the 1880s. George was probably the most influential man of one idea in nineteenth-century Anglo-American history. His panacea, the Single Tax (the appropriation of all rent by taxation) was based on his view that there was no real conflict between capital and labor. The "antagonism of interests," he argued "is in reality between labor and capital on the one side and land ownership on the other."[55] The

great landowners used their natural monopoly to demand exorbitant rents and thus appropriate without compensation the lion's share of the increased wealth from material progress that ought to go to the workmen and entrepreneurs who actually produced it. This perversion of the economic order impoverished the proletariat, imperiled the manufacturer, and upset the natural balance of supply and demand. It was the real cause of depression, class conflict, and the spreading poverty that seemed an inevitable companion to progress.

Characteristically, Howard accepted everything in George's theory that pointed toward reconciliation and rejected everything that promised conflict. He rejected the Single Tax because he saw that it meant the expropriation of a whole class. He accepted, however, George's view that the solution to the land question would restore the economy to a healthy balance and create the conditions for a reconciliation of capital and labor. He believed he had found the solution to the land question himself. The Garden City, he wrote, "will, by a purely natural process, make it gradually impossible for any landlord class to exist at all." Private landholding "will die a natural but not too sudden death."[56] Building Garden Cities would accomplish all of George's aims "in a manner which need cause no ill-will, strife or bitterness; is constitutional; requires no revolutionary legislation; and involves no direct attack on vested interest."[57] The Garden City company would, in fact, enjoy all the privileges of a profit-making concern. The legal forms that landlords had designed to protect their own interests would now foster the creation of a higher form of society.

The powers extended to the Garden City company as sole landlord would be greater than the legal authority possessed by any nineteenth-century English municipality. Through its control of all leases it could effectively enforce the ground plan and zone the community without special legal authority. Howard was a firm believer in "gas and water socialism," and he stipulated that the town's board of management should provide all utilities on a nonprofit basis. He also thought the town might well establish municipal bakeries and laundries.[58]

Although the Garden City company would have the legal right to own and operate all the industry in the Garden City, Howard favored a balance of public and private control. The large factories on the periphery were clearly to be established by private industry, though Howard hoped that through profit sharing they would eventually take on a cooperative character. They still would be subject to the authority that the town as sole landlord could impose: No polluters or employers of "sweated" labor would be allowed.[59] The board of management would also share responsibility for public services with private citizens. Howard hoped that individuals would establish a large group of what he called "pro-municipal enterprises." These were public services whose necessity was not yet recognized by the majority of the citizens, but "those who have

the welfare of society at heart [would], in the free air of the city, be always able to experiment on their own responsibility, . . . and enlarge the public understanding."[60] In addition to the more conventional charitable and philanthropic activities, "pro-municipal enterprises" included cooperative building and pension societies.

As income from rents grew, the municipality would gradually take over the services that voluntary cooperation had initiated. In industry, too, Howard believed that the evolutionary trend was toward greater public ownership and control. The most important principle, however, was that no one has the right to impose a degree of socialism for which the citizens were not ready. The elimination of landlord's rents would remove, in Howard's view, any immediate conflict of capital with labor and permit the peaceful coexistence of capitalist and socialist industry. The balance between the public and private sectors must shift slowly with the increasing capacity of the citizens for cooperation.

Howard had the patience to begin with imperfect forms because he had the capacity to see his ideal society evolving in time. He realized that a single Garden City of 30,000 was too small to provide the full measure of diversity that a genuine city must have. A Garden City could not, however, increase its size or density; that would spoil its plan. He proposed that it grow by establishing a new sister city beyond the Agricultural Belt. Howard believed that the cities should eventually organize themselves into "town clusters, each town in the cluster being of different design from the others, yet the whole forming one large and well-thought-out plan."[61] A diagram that appeared in *To-morrow* showed six Garden Cities arranged in a circle around a larger Center City. The plan had the cities connected by a circular canal, which provided power, water, and transportation. In the 1902 edition the canal was replaced by a more sober rapid transit system.[62]

The Social City, as Howard called each cluster of towns, represented his most advanced conception of the marriage of town and country; here "each inhabitant of the whole group, though in one sense living in a town of small size, would be in reality living in, and would enjoy all the advantages of, a great and most beautiful city; and yet all the fresh delights of the country . . . would be within a very few minutes' ride or walk."[63] With small communities already established as the basic units in society, these units could be arranged in planned federations to secure the benefits of larger size as well. Rapid communications between the towns meant greater convenience for trade, and, "because the people, in their collective capacity own the land on which this beautiful group of cities is built, the public buildings, the churches, the schools and universities, the libraries, picture galleries, theatres, would be on a scale of magnificence which no city in the world whose land is in pawn to private individuals can afford."[64] Once established, the Social City would

become the base for still higher stages of evolution that Howard never ventured to describe.

Howard's reluctance to prescribe every detail or to foresee every contingency is one of the most important aspects of his method. The visionary planner can easily become a despot of the imagination. Working alone, deprived of the checks and balances of other minds, he is tempted to become the *roi soleil* of his realm and to order every detail of life of his ideal society. If Howard's geometric plans resemble a Baroque *Residenzstadt,* Howard himself was singularly free of the pretensions of a Baroque monarch. His plans, as he pointed out, were merely diagrams to be modified when put into practice.

The same may be said for his plans for social organization. In Howard's time the advocates of Socialism and Individualism (both usually capitalized) confronted each other like Matthew Arnold's ignorant armies. Bellamy, as we have seen, believed that the entire economy of the United States could be centrally directed by a few men of "fair ability." Herbert Spencer in his individualist phase held that the use of tax money to support public libraries was a step toward collectivist slavery.[65] Howard did not presume to judge this momentous debate. He made the spatial reorganization of society his fundamental demand because he believed that a new environment would open possibilities for the reconciliation of freedom and order that neither Bellamy nor Spencer could imagine. Howard sought to discover the minimum of organization that would secure the benefits of planning while leaving to individuals the greatest possible control over their own lives. He was a collectivist who hated bureaucratic paternalism and an apostle of organization who realized that planning must stay within self-imposed limits.

Building the Garden City

Howard's theories were now irrevocably tied to what happened on the more than 3,000 acres in Hertfordshire. The necessity of finding large sums of money to develop the new city made Howard increasingly dependent on the support of a few Liberal magnates like Cadbury and Lever. He never succeeded in building the broad coalition of reformist groups he had hoped to assemble – a fact that inevitably modified the tone and substance of his ideas. One source of working-class support that could have improved the balance was conspicuous in its absence: the cooperative movement. Howard looked to the "cooperators" to provide the leadership and experience for the working class to begin its own enterprises. "The true remedy for capitalist oppression where it exists," he wrote, "is not the strike of no work but the strike of true work. . . . If labor leaders spent half the energy in cooperative organization they now waste in cooperative disorganization, the end of our present unjust system would be at hand."[66]

The cooperative movement, moreover, was probably the only working-class organization that had the resources to contribute significantly to the building of the Garden City. The movement had more than two million members organized into 1,600 local societies, which sold £92 million of goods in 1903 and distributed £10 million in profits.[67] The cooperative societies had either built or advanced the money for more than 37,000 houses by 1903, and the movement's factories manufactured more than £10 million of goods annually.[68]

Howard's supporters in the movement hoped that cooperators would be the principal builders of the Garden City. At each of the annual Cooperative Congresses from 1900 to 1909 they argued that the next step toward the cooperative commonwealth was to organize the movement's stores, factories, and homes (which were now scattered over Great Britain) into the new environment that Howard promised.[69] Despite influential support among the national leaders – J. C. Grey, chairman of the Cooperative Wholesale Society, was among the founders of the Manchester branch of the Garden City Association[70] – the congresses refused either to support First Garden City Ltd., or to build their own Garden City. The individual distributive societies were more anxious to preserve their independence than they were to create a new civilization. The cooperative counterbalance to capitalist investment and production at Letchworth never developed.

In the absence of any significant working-class support, the values of Neville and his fellow businessmen dominated First Garden City Ltd. For Howard, the Garden City was an environment in which capitalism could be peacefully superseded. Most of his supporters, however, looked to the Garden City as the place where capitalism could be most easily preserved.

Neville, who assumed the post of chairman of the executive of First Garden City Ltd., proposed to raise funds to begin construction by issuing £300,000 in shares, with the annual dividend not to exceed 5 percent of their par value. Neville believed that if the shares were to be sold, the company must purge itself of any utopian hopes and present itself at all times as a solid business venture and a good investment. "For mere philanthropy the money would not be forthcoming."[71] When Howard in his speeches mentioned the risks involved in starting a new city, Neville sternly reproached him. "I appreciate your reluctance to ask poor people to invest their savings, but there is all the difference in the world between refraining from enticing and deprecating investment."[72]

Faced with a board of prominent businessmen who were used to getting their own way, Howard was in danger of losing control of his own movement. The first test came over the land question. Howard proposed to retain the rise in land values for the community by disposing of all land in thousand-year leases that would provide for reassessment by an impartial committee every four years. If the value had increased over the last assessment, the rent would also be increased.[73] Howard hoped, as we

have seen, that the rising income from rents would soon far exceed what was necessary to pay the 5 percent return to the stockholders and that the surplus could be used for community services.

Neville believed, however, that potential residents of Letchworth would be confused by the unfamiliar features of such a lease and would be frightened off by the fear of drastic rent increases. He therefore advocated a standard ninety-nine-year lease at a fixed rent.[74] The community, in other words, would have to wait one hundred years before negotiating a new lease at a higher rent and thus collecting its share of the "unearned increment."

The other businessmen on the board agreed with Neville. Howard, who was still earning his living as a stenographer, was no match for a cocoa millionaire or a soap magnate. He took the defeat in good spirits because he agreed with the businessmen that concern for details must not stand in the way of the speedy completion of the town. The prototype must first exist; it would then inspire others to more perfect efforts.

> *The first result [of the building of Letchworth] will be that the number of people who favor the Garden City will be increased a hundredfold; and then a glorious task which an insignificant minority could not compass will be found quite easy by a majority of the nation. A splendid organization will be created and a City will then rise as superior in its beauty and magnificence to our first crude attempt as is the finished canvas of a great artist to the rough and untaught attempts of a schoolboy.*[75]

In 1903 the company made perhaps its most important decision: It chose the firm of Parker and Unwin to be the architects of Letchworth. Barry Parker was a young architect from Derbyshire who began his career as a designer of textiles and wallpapers influenced by the arts-and-crafts movement.[76] Raymond Unwin, whose association with the Garden City was the start of a long career in city planning that would make him the leading British authority, was trained as an engineer and came to architecture under the influence of William Morris.[77] Both men were early supporters of Howard; as followers of Morris, they were engaged in a search that paralleled Howard's own. Morris had taught that the artist's efforts to create a beautiful society could not be separated from the activist's attempts to create a just one. "Before there can be a city greatly beautiful," wrote Unwin, "there must be some noble common life to find expression."[78]

But if Parker and Unwin sympathized with Howard's goals, they had no use for his rationalistic, geometric methods of town planning. They gave to the Garden City movement their own vision of the "city greatly beautiful," a vision derived from the medieval village as seen through the eyes of William Morris. They wanted to adapt what they believed were the still valid principles of traditional English town planning to the

decentralized society of the future. Where Howard had expressed the architecture of cooperation in the mechanical symmetry of his original plan, Parker and Unwin sought instead what they called "organic unity."

They followed Howard's lead to the extent of clearly separating the town from the countryside that surrounded it. They placed the new city roughly in the middle of the Letchworth estate, setting aside 1,200 acres for the city proper and 2,800 acres for the Agricultural Belt that would surround it. Within the city, however, they rejected Howard's rigidly symmetrical diagrams and instead sought a more subtle "organic" sense of order suggested by the terrain. They took advantage of the positions of the hills, streams, an old Roman road, and even some of the larger trees to define the plan of the town. The "The Crystal Palace" was replaced by a gently curving street of shops. Only the town center remained exactly what Howard intended it to be: a formal arrangement of municipal and cultural buildings.[79]

The contrast between Howard and his two architects was not, however, one simply between Howard's utilitarian bias and Parker and Unwin's aesthetic bent. If anything, Parker and Unwin were more practical than Howard. Industry, instead of forming a uniform periphery to Howard's circle, was grouped into an industrial park adjacent to the power plant and to the railroad. The tracks, in turn, separated industry from the residential area. The plan is effective without calling attention to itself through a calculated prettiness. In their quest for a natural unity Parker and Unwin succeeded – perhaps too well. As Herbert Read has pointed out, it is possible to visit Letchworth and even to live there without being aware that it is a conscious creation.[80]

Parker and Unwin believed that organic unity must extend up from the plan to embrace a common style of architecture. They saw the eclectic architecture of their time – in which a suburban villa tricked out with classical porticoes might be sandwiched between a Gothic extravaganza on the right and Renaissance palazzo on the left – as a horrible symptom of the chaotic individualism of their time. They held that the victory of cooperation in the Garden City could best be expressed in a consistent style derived from traditional village architecture, the brick and stucco, the gables and tile roofs of Hertfordshire. This was not mere antiquarianism, for Parker and Unwin "democratized" traditional architecture. Where other architects had used the vocabulary of picturesque gables and tiled roofs to glorify the suburban castles of the rich, Parker and Unwin employed traditional designs to express the unity of a cooperatively organized community of equals. In the context of their time, their designs for Letchworth stood for cleanliness, simplicity, and the honest use of materials – qualities the arts-and-crafts movement associated with the fourteenth century and hoped to revive in the twentieth. The fourteenth-century village, they believed, was the truest community that England had ever known, and its beauty was the expression of a unique balance

of order and uniformity. This balance they hoped to recapture in that revitalized community of the future, the Garden City.

Parker and Unwin's designs thus bore little resemblance to Howard's plan for geometric boulevards and iron-and-steel Crystal Palaces. Nevertheless, both concepts derived from a common search for an architecture of cooperation. Parker and Unwin's plan was a sort of translation of Howard's original diagrams. It was, however, a loose translation that introduced some themes of its own. Unwin's hope that the Garden City would "give life just that order, that crystalline structure it had in feudal times,"[81] sounds a note of nostalgia for vanished stability not heard in Howard. Unwin's aesthetic glorification of the traditional village was also a glorification of the stable social relations he imagined existed there, and an implicit critique of the modern quest for change. For Unwin, the beautiful old English villages had "the appearance of being an organic whole, the home of a community" because they were "the expression of a corporate life in which all the different units were personally in touch with each other, consciously and frankly accepting their relations, and, on the whole, content with them."[82] Like the villagers themselves, "every building honestly confessed just what it was, and so fell into its place."[83] The Garden City, too, would be a community where everyone has his place and is content with it.

Parker and Unwin's concept of the Garden City thus had its reactionary as well as its forward-looking aspects. The two architects lacked Howard's confident faith in industrialization and the nineteenth-century world of rapid social change. For them, the Garden City was a place in which industrialization could be kept in its proper (subordinate) place and the incessant striving of modern times would yield to order and contentment. In their idealization of the English village, Parker and Unwin brought to prominence an element in the Garden City that had hardly existed in Howard: the fear of the great city and its social turmoil, the desire to discard the burdens of progress and return to the simple life. Their plans embodied the new stage in the Garden City movement, the stage in which Howard's influence was counterbalanced by Liberals like Cadbury, who looked back to an imagined paternalistic order. With their mixture of the enlightened and the medieval, Parker and Unwin reflected this split in the movement between an optimistic endorsement of the future and a nostalgic wish to escape from the modern world.

But Parker and Unwin, like the Garden City movement in general, ought to be judged not only on their realized plans but also on their aspirations. Their most revolutionary idea was never put into practice. In 1901, even before the decision to build a Garden City had been undertaken, Unwin proposed that the houses in the new city be organized cooperatively. His plan provided for "quadrangles" of homes in which three sides would be devoted to private apartments and the fourth to a common dining room, recreation room, and nursery. Food and coal

would be purchased jointly, and the residents would share the cost of hiring cooks and maids. The quadrangle, he hoped, would become the basic unit of Garden City architecture, giving the city a "greater harmony and unity of effect" than would be possible where the land was carved into separate plots.[84]

Howard himself took up the plan in 1906 – "I believe the time has now come when [cooperation] can be successfully tried as one of the central ideas in domestic life,"[85] he wrote – but even his efforts resulted in only one quadrangle called Homesgarth.[86] Although Unwin modeled the quadrangle on an Oxford college, Homesgarth was too close in conception and design to communitarian experiments to be entirely respectable. Homesgarth, however, was no utopian scheme. "Its first object," Howard said, was "to provide a house of comparative comfort and beauty for the numerous folks of the middle class who have a hard struggle for existence on a mere budget – for those who require domestic help but can very ill afford it."[87] Homesgarth's small scale – only twenty-four families – and careful balance between family privacy and community functions is characteristic of Howard's pragmatic reinterpretation of the utopian tradition. In Howard's view, it was a piece of the new civilization and an important attempt to make cooperation part of the daily life of the Garden City.

Parker and Unwin hoped that even if First Garden City Ltd. would not support their plans for quadrangles, it would still provide funds to build the houses of Letchworth according to their designs. The company, however, was in serious financial difficulty. The original stock issue sold slowly; the directors bought £40,000, and some £60,000 was sold to the public in the first year, but it took three years to reach £150,000.[88] During those three years the company was forced to spend over £600,000 to provide the roads, gasworks, electrical generators, and other utilities the town needed.[89] The company was able to borrow the funds for these necessities, but it was unwilling to go more deeply in debt. Many of the first houses in Letchworth were built by speculative contractors whose designs introduced precisely those eccentricities that Parker and Unwin had wanted to banish from the town. These homes, however, were well suited to the tastes of Letchworth's first residents, many of whom were men and women of independent means and "advanced" opinions. Their enthusiasms included theosophy, vegetarianism, dress reform, and amateur theatricals; Letchworth was soon reputed to have more committees per person than any other town in England.[90] The company, fearing that Letchworth might soon get the reputation as a colony of cranks, then solemnly informed the press that only one resident habitually wore a toga and sandals.[91] When several men broke with convention by refusing to wear hats (which were then considered as necessary to outdoor attire as trousers), the town staged a public debate between the "Hatters" and the "No-Hatters." A company agent who believed that manufacturers would

refuse to locate their plants where the norms of society were so openly questioned interrupted the proceedings and roundly denounced the "No-Hatters" as unpatriotic citizens who did not have the interests of Letchworth at heart.[92]

Despite the company's apprehensions, manufacturers did come to Letchworth. Only a few, like the cooperatively run Garden City Press Ltd., were attracted to the city for ideological reasons. Most came for precisely the practical reasons that Howard and especially Neville had foreseen. The rise in business activity in the first decade of the twentieth century created a demand for increased space that was hard to satisfy in London. Letchworth offered low rents, minimal taxes, and ample room to grow. When, for example, the publishing firm of J. W. Dent discovered that its London facilities offered no room for expansion, the publisher established a branch plant at Letchworth. The "Everyman" series of inexpensive classics was printed there.[93] Other enterprises began as the project of an amateur inventor and moved from a Letchworth garage to the industrial park. Light engineering and printing were the principal Garden City industries.[94]

The new factories promised to make Letchworth a self-supporting community. As houses and shops began to line the streets that Parker and Unwin had laid out, the social structure of the new town underwent a rapid change. A census taken of the 1,400 Letchworth residents in 1905 showed that almost all of them were from two groups: middle-class men and women of independent means (and their servants) and the skilled artisans who were building the new town.[95] By 1907 the population had more than doubled, and almost all the new residents were factory workers.[96]

Howard was now faced with the challenge to make good his claim that the Garden City would bring to working people health and living standards they could never have obtained in the old cities. Whatever the interests of his associates, he had not forgotten his belief that the Garden City would provide all the benefits that others were seeking from political and economic revolution. In practice, this challenge focused on housing. Could the Garden City accomplish what no other public or private organization in England had been able to do: construct decent dwellings that even the lowest-paid workers could afford? This meant, of course, building under existing social conditions. Howard had to assume that the tenants' wages would remain low, that interest on capital would continue to be paid, and that no government subsidy could be expected. If the Garden City would create good housing for all its citizens under these circumstances, then Howard's claim that it represented "the peaceful path to real reform" would receive powerful support.

Howard was convinced that planning, architectural ingenuity, and voluntary cooperation could solve the housing question. A cooperative

building society, Garden City Tenants Ltd., was established in 1904 to raise capital for workers' housing.[97] As a stopgap measure, Thomas Adams persuaded the editor of *Country Life* to hold that magazine's "cheap cottage" competition at Letchworth. After the exhibition, the model cottages were sold very cheaply indeed to Letchworth workers.[98]

Garden City Tenants Ltd. then turned to Raymond Unwin for the multiunit dwellings the new town needed. Unwin's designs show the Garden City movement at its best – pragmatic, democratic, responsive to the needs of the people it served.[99] Unwin gave the same attention to these projects that other architects devoted to the rich man's villa. He made sure that every cottage got its share of sunlight, that every window and door was properly placed. That institutional bleakness that afflicts British (and not only British) architects when planning for the "lower orders" was completely absent from Unwin's work. Instead, there was a real sense of individual well-being and community solidarity, precisely the "organic unity" that Unwin had proclaimed.

The individual cottages were not left detached, as in the middle-class villas, but joined into rows of three to ten. These rows were then grouped around a central courtyard or field. This plan used far less land per unit than the villas and gave to each family the privacy of a two-story dwelling with its own garden. At the same time, there was substantial open space that could be shared in common. Within each cottage Unwin decided not to attempt to duplicate middle-class layouts, with their separate parlor, living room, dining room, and kitchen; on the small scale of the cottage this would have made the rooms claustrophobic. Moreover, Unwin wanted to design houses that "honestly confessed just what they were," not scaled-down copies of inappropriate models. He appreciated the fact that working-class family life traditionally centered around the hearth, and he therefore designed a combination living room–kitchen to be as comfortable, spacious, and open as possible.

At its best, Unwin's work represents that fruitful balance of individual and community which the Garden City stood for and which housing projects have seldom achieved since. It had, however, one great deficiency. When the costs of the new houses were added up, only skilled workers could afford them. The wages of the unskilled were simply too close to subsistence level for them to be able to pay the rent for any home that Unwin or Howard would call decent. As Howard later admitted, it was the bicycle that saved the situation. Workers who could not find housing in the Garden City bicycled each day from their jobs to apartments in the older towns beyond the Agricultural Belt, where cheap but substandard accommodations could be found.[100] One can hardly blame Unwin and Howard for their failure. If they were unable to build decent workers' housing without a subsidy, neither could anyone else.

These efforts in housing illustrate the real strengths and ultimate

limitations of the Garden City idea as a social movement. By 1910 the practicality of Howard's basic concept had been proved. The new town of Letchworth was a clean, healthy, and well-planned environment; it had shown its capacity to attract industry and residents; and the First Garden City Ltd., though still financially pressed, was beginning to reap the rewards of its investment and declare its first dividend. The housing question, however, demonstrated that, despite Howard's hopes, the Garden City could not create its own oasis of social justice in an unjust society. Lower costs, better planning, community ownership of land – none of these could fully compensate for the inequities that were inherent in the social system of Howard's time. The path to real reform lay outside the Garden City.

By 1910, however, Howard was still looking to the future with confidence. He realized that Letchworth had its limitations, but Letchworth was only the first working model, which would surely inspire dozens and then hundreds of improved successors. But in 1910 the First Garden City was still the only Garden City, and no more were in the works. The problem for Howard was, where were the other Garden Cities that would begin to transform England?

The Radiant City

The Radiant City retained the most important principle of the Contemporary City: the juxtaposition of a collective realm of order and administration with an individualistic realm of family life and participation. This juxtaposition became the key to Le Corbusier's attempt to resolve the syndicalist dilemma of authority and participation. Both elements of the doctrine receive intense expression in their respective spheres. Harmony is in the structure of the whole city and in the complete life of its citizens.

The Radiant City was a more daring and difficult synthesis than the Contemporary City. In his effort to realize the contradictory elements of syndicalism, Le Corbusier made the Radiant City at once more authoritarian and more libertarian than its predecessor. Within the sphere of collective life, authority has become absolute. The Contemporary City had lacked any single power to regulate all the separate private corporations that accomplished the essential work of society; Le Corbusier had then believed that the invisible hand of free competition would create the most efficient coordination. The Great Depression robbed him of his faith. He now held that organization must extend beyond the large corporations. They had rationalized their own organizations, but the economy as a whole remained wasteful, anarchic, irrational. The planned allocation of manpower and resources that had taken place within each corporation must now be accomplished for society. In the Radiant City every aspect of productive life is

administered from above according to one plan. This plan replaces the marketplace with total administration; experts match society's needs to its productive capacities.

The preordained harmony that Le Corbusier had called for in urban reconstruction would now be imposed on all productive life. The great works of construction would become only one element in the plan. This was a crucial extension of the concept of planning. Ebenezer Howard and Frank Lloyd Wright had believed that once the environment had been designed, the sources of disorder in society would be minimized and individuals could be left to pursue their own initiatives. This belief rested on a faith in a "natural economic order," a faith that Le Corbusier no longer shared. He confronted a world threatened by chaos and collapse. It seemed that only discipline could create the order he sought so ardently. Coordination must become conscious and total. Above all, society needed authority and a plan.

Syndicalism, Le Corbusier believed, would provide a "pyramid of natural hierarchies" on which order and planning could be based. The bottom of this pyramid is the *syndicat*, the group of workers, white-collar employees, and engineers who run their own factory. The workers have the responsibility of choosing their most able colleague to be their manager and to represent them at the regional trade council. Le Corbusier believed that although citizens would usually find it impossible to identify the most able man among a host of politicians, each worker is normally able to choose his natural leader. "Every man is capable of judging the facts of his trade," he observed.[101]

The regional council of plant managers represents the first step in the hierarchy. Each level corresponds to a level of administrative responsibility. The manager runs his factory; the regional leaders administer the plants in their region. The regional council sends its most able members to a national council, which is responsible for the overall control of the trade. The leader of this council meets with fellow leaders to administer the national plan. This highest group is responsible for coordinating the entire production of the country. If, for example, the national plan calls for mass housing, they allot the capital needed for each region and set the goals for production. The order is passed down to the regional council, which assigns tasks to individual factories and contractors. The elected representatives of the *syndicat* return from the regional council with instructions that determine his factory's role in the national productive effort.

This hierarchy of administration has replaced the state. As Saint-Simon had urged, an individual's power corresponds exactly to that person's responsibilities in the structure of production. The administrator issues the orders necessary for fulfilling the required quotas, and these orders provide the direction that society needs. The divisive issues of parliamentary politics cannot arise, for everyone shares a common concern

that the resources of society be administered as efficiently as possible. Even the tasks of the national council are administrative rather than political. The members do not apportion wealth and power among competing interests groups. Their task, like that of all the other functionaries, is a "technical" one: they carry out the plan.

"Plans are not political," Le Corbusier wrote.[102] The plan's complex provisions, covering every aspect of production, distribution, and construction, represent a necessary and objective ordering of society. The plan is necessary because the Machine Age requires conscious control. It is objective because the Machine Age imposes essentially the same discipline on all societies. Planning involves the rational mastery of industrial process and the application of that mastery to the specific conditions of each nation. The plan is a "rational and lyric monument" to man's capacity to organize.

The plan is formulated by an elite of experts detached from all social pressure. They work "outside the fevers of mayors' and prefects' offices," away from the "cries of electors and the cries of victims." Their plans are "established serenely, lucidly. They take account only of human truths."[103] In the planner's formulations, "the motive forces of a civilization pass from the subjective realm of consciousness to the objective realm of facts." Plans are "just, long-term, established on the realities of the century, imagined by a creative passion."[104]

This plan for Le Corbusier was more than a collection of statistics and instructions; it was a social work of art. It brought to consciousness the complex yet satisfying harmonies of an orderly, productive world. It was the score for the great industrial orchestra. The plan summed up the unity that underlay the division of labor in society; it expressed the full range of exchange and cooperation that is necessary to an advanced economy.

Le Corbusier used the vocabulary and structures of syndicalism to advance his own vision of a beautifully organized world. His "pyramid of natural hierarchies" was intended to give the human structure of organization the same clarity and order as the great skyscrapers of the business center. The beauty of the organization was the product of the perfect cooperation of everyone in the hierarchy. It was the expression of human solidarity in creating a civilization in the midst of the hostile forces of nature. The natural hierarchy was one means of attaining the sublime.

People at work create a world that is truly human. But that world, once created, is a realm of freedom where people live in accord with nature, not in opposition to it. Like the Contemporary City, the Radiant City identifies the realm of freedom with the residential district. As if in recognition of the need to counterbalance the industrial realm's increased emphasis on organization, Le Corbusier has displaced the towers of administration from the central position they occupied in

the earlier plan. The residential district stands in the place of honor in the Radiant City.

It is, moreover, a transformed residential district. Le Corbusier had lost the enthusiasm for capitalism that had led him originally to segregate housing in the Contemporary City according to class – elite in the center, proletariat at the outskirts. Now he was a revolutionary syndicalist, with a new appreciation of workers' rights. When he visited the United States in 1935, he found much to admire in the luxury apartment houses that lined Central Park and Lake Shore Drive, but he added, "My own thinking is directed towards the crowds in the subway who come home at night to dismal dwellings. The millions of beings sacrificed to a life without hope, without rest – without sky, sun, greenery."[105] Housing in the Radiant City is designed for them. The residential district embodies Le Corbusier's new conviction that the world of freedom must be egalitarian. "If the city were to become a human city," he proclaimed, "it would be a city without classes."[106]

No longer does the residential district simply mirror the inequalities in the realm of production. Instead, the relation between the two is more complex, reflecting Le Corbusier's resolve to make the Radiant City a city of organization *and* freedom. The realm of production in the Radiant City is even more tightly organized, its hierarchies of command and subordination even stricter than in the Contemporary City. At the same time, the residential district – the realm of leisure and self-fulfillment – is radically libertarian, its principles of equality and cooperation standing in stark opposition to the hierarchy of the industrial world. The citizen in Le Corbusier's syndicalist society thus experiences both organization and freedom as part of his daily life.

The centers of life in the Radiant City are the great high-rise apartment blocks, which Le Corbusier calls "Unités." These structures, each of which is a neighborhood with 2,700 residents, mark the culmination of the principles of housing that he had been expounding since the Dom-Inos of 1914. Like the Dom-Ino house, the Unité represents the application of mass-production techniques; but where the Dom-Ino represents the principle in its most basic form, the Unité is a masterful expression of scale, complexity, and sophistication. The disappointments of the 1920s and the upheavals of the 1930s had only strengthened Le Corbusier in his faith that a great new age of the machine was about to dawn. In the plans for the Unité he realized that promise of a *collective* beauty that had been his aim in the Dom-Ino design; he achieved a collective grandeur, which the Dom-Ino houses had only hinted at; and finally, he foresaw for all the residents of the Unité a freedom and abundance beyond even that which he had planned for the elite of the Contemporary City. The apartments in the Unité are not assigned on the basis of a worker's position in the industrial hierarchy but according to the size of his family and their needs. In designing these apartments, Le Corbusier

remarked that he "thought neither of rich nor of poor but of man."[107] He wanted to get away both from the concept of luxury housing, in which the wasteful consumption of space becomes a sign of status, and from the concept of *Existenzminimum*, the design of workers' housing based on the absolute hygienic minimums. He believed that housing could be made to the "human scale," right in its proportions for everyone, neither cramped nor wasteful. No one would want anything larger nor get anything smaller.

The emphasis in the Unité, however, is not on the individual apartment but on the collective services provided to all the residents. As in the Villa-Apartment Blocks of the Contemporary City, Le Corbusier followed the principle that the cooperative sharing of leisure facilities could give to each family a far more varied and beautiful environment than even the richest individual could afford in a single-family house. These facilities, moreover, take on a clear social function as the reward and recompense for the eight hours of disciplined labor in a factory or office that are required of all citizens in a syndicalist society. The Unité, for example, has a full range of workshops for traditional handicrafts whose techniques can no longer be practiced in industries devoted to mass production. Here are meeting rooms of all sizes for participatory activities that have no place in the hierarchical sphere of production. There are cafes, restaurants, and shops where sociability can be cultivated for its own sake. Most important, in Le Corbusier's own estimation, the Unité provides the opportunity for a full range of physical activities that are severely curtailed during working hours in an industrial society. Within each Unité there is a full-scale gymnasium; on the roof are tennis courts, swimming pools, and even sand beaches. Once again, the high-rise buildings cover only 15 percent of the land, and the open space around them is elaborately landscaped into playing fields, gardens, and parkland.

The most basic services that the Unité provides are those that make possible a new concept of the family. Le Corbusier envisioned a society in which men and women would work full-time as equals. He therefore presumed the end of the family as an economic unit in which women were responsible for domestic services while men worked for wages. In the Unité, cooking, cleaning, and child raising are services provided by society. Each building has its day-care center, nursery and primary school, cooperative laundry, cleaning service, and food store. In the Radiant City the family no longer has an economic function to perform. It exists as an end in itself.

Le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright were both intensely concerned with the preservation of the family in an industrial society, but here as elsewhere they adopted diametrically opposite strategies. Wright wished to revive and strengthen the traditional economic role of the family, to ensure its survival by making it the center both of the society's work and

of its leisure. Wright believed in a life in which labor and leisure would be one, whereas Le Corbusier subjected even the family to the stark division between work and play that marks the Radiant City. The family belongs to the realm of play. Indeed, it virtually ceases to exist during the working day. When mother and father leave their apartment in the morning for their jobs, their children accompany them down on the elevator. The parents drop them off at the floor where the school or day-care center is located and pick them up after work. The family reassembles in the afternoon, perhaps round the pool or at the gym, and when the family members return to their apartment they find it already cleaned, the laundry dŏne and returned, the food ordered in the morning already delivered and prepared for serving. Individual families might still choose to cook their own food, do their own laundry, raise vegetables on their balconies, or even raise their own children. In the Radiant City, however, these activities have become leisure-time hobbies like woodworking or weaving, quaint relics of the pre-mechanical age.

The Unité is thus high-rise architecture for a new civilization, and Le Corbusier was careful to emphasize that its design could be truly realized only after society had been revolutionized. He therefore never concerned himself with such problems as muggings in the parks or vandalism in the elevators. In the Radiant City, crime and poverty no longer exist.

But if the Unité looks to the future, its roots are in the nineteenth-century utopian hopes for a perfect cooperative society, the same hopes that inspired Ebenezer Howard's cooperative quadrangles. Peter Serenyi has aptly compared the Unité to that French utopian palace of communal pleasures, the phalanstery of Charles Fourier.[108] An early nineteenth-century rival of Saint-Simon, Fourier envisioned a structure resembling the château of Versailles to house the 1,600 members of his "phalanx" or rural utopian community. "We have no conception of the compound or collective forms of luxury," Fourier complained, and the phalanstery was designed to make up that lack.[109] He believed that in a properly run society all individual desires could find their appropriate gratification. The phalanstery, therefore, contains an elaborate series of lavish public rooms: theaters, libraries, ballrooms, and – Fournier's special pride – the dining rooms where "exquisite food and a piquant selection of dining companions" can always be found.

The phalanstery can be seen as the nineteenth-century anticipation and the Unité as the twentieth-century realization of architecture in the service of collective pleasure. Both designs represent what Le Corbusier termed "the architecture of happiness," architecture created to deliver what he was fond of calling "the essential joys." Fourier, however, could only express his vision in the anachronistic image of the baroque palace. Le Corbusier finds the forms of collective pleasure in the most advanced techniques of mass production. For him, the architecture of happiness is also the architecture for the industrial era.

The comparison of the phalanstery and the Unité suggests, finally, the complexity of Le Corbusier's ideal city. For Fourier was the bitter antagonist of Saint-Simon, whose philosophy is so central to Le Corbusier's social thought. The rivalry of the two nineteenth-century prophets was more than personal. Since their time, French utopian thought has been divided into two distinct traditions. The Saint-Simonian tradition is the dream of society as the perfect industrial hierarchy. Its setting is urban, its thought technological, its goal production, and its highest value organization. Fourier and his followers have envisioned society as the perfect community: rural, small-scale, egalitarian, dedicated to pleasure and self-fulfillment. In the Radiant City, Le Corbusier combines these two traditions into an original synthesis. He places a Fourierist phalanstery in the center of a Saint-Simonian industrial society. Community and organization thus find intense and appropriate expression: both are integral parts of Le Corbusier's ideal city for the Machine Age.

Notes

1 Joseph Conrad, *The Secret Agent* (New York, 1953), p. 11. The quotation is drawn from the Preface, first published in 1921.

2 For statistics of urban growth, see Adna Ferrin Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1899).

3 Hsi-Huey Liang, "Lower-class Immigrants in Wilhelmine Berlin," In *The Urbanization of European Society in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. Andrew Lees and Lynn Lees (Lexington, Mass. 1976), p. 223.

4 Le Corbusier, *La ville radieuse* (Boulogne-Seine, 1935), p. 181.

5 For Owen, see J. F. C. Harrison, *Quest for the New Moral World* (New York, 1969).

6 For Fourier, see Jonathan Beecher and Richard Bienvenu, eds., *The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier* (Boston, 1971).

7 For Haussmann and his influence see David H. Pinkney, *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris* (Princeton, N.J., 1958); Howard Saalman, *Haussmann: Paris Transformed* (New York, 1971); and Anthony Sutcliffe, *The Autumn of Central Paris* (London, 1970).

8 Peter H. Mann, "Octavia Hill: An Appraisal," *Town Planning Review* 23, no. 3 (Oct. 1953): 223–237.

9 Friedrich Engels, *Zur Wohnungsfrage*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1887).

10 See Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918–1945* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968).

11 Le Corbusier, *Urbanisme* (Paris, 1925), p. 135.

12 Lewis Mumford, "The Garden City Idea and Modern Planning," introductory essay to F. J. Osborn's edition of *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 29. Although Osborn's edition bears the title of the 1902 edition, his text restores portions of the 1898 text that were cut in 1902. Osborn's is therefore a "definitive" text and I follow his usage in always referring to Howard's book as *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. All further references will come from Osborn's edition, abbreviated *GCT*.